



05-01-03

1653

PTO/SB/21 (03-03)

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL  
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/553,424
Filing Date	April 19, 2000
First Named Inventor	Schneider, Luke V.
Art Unit	1653
Examiner Name	Samuel W. Liu
Attorney Docket Number	020444-000400US

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

1

**ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)**☐ Fee Transmittal Form☐ Fee Attached☐ Amendment/Reply☐ After Final☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)☐ Extension of Time Request☐ Express Abandonment Request☐ Information Disclosure Statement☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)☐ Response to Missing Parts/  
Incomplete Application☐ Response to Missing Parts  
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53☐ Drawing(s)☐ Licensing-related Papers☐ Petition☐ Petition to Convert to a  
Provisional Application☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation  
Change of Correspondence Address☐ Terminal Disclaimer☐ Request for Refund☐ CD, Number of CD(s)☐ After Allowance Communication to  
Group☐ Appeal Communication to Board of  
Appeals and Interferences☐ Appeal Communication to Group  
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)☐ Proprietary Information☐ Status Letter☒ Other Enclosure(s)  
(please identify below):

Return Postcard

Response to Restriction Requirement

Remarks

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to  
Deposit Account 20-1430.**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**Firm  
or  
IndividualTownsend and Townsend and Crew LLP  
Scott L. Aussenhus

Reg. No. 42,271

Signature

Date

April 28, 2003

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

Express Mail Label: EL 889383115 US

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with "Express Mail Post Office to Address" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on this date April 28, 2003 and is addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

Typed or printed name

Maisie C. Livengood

Signature

Date

April 28, 2003

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DE 7102786 v1



Express Mail® Label No. EL 889383115 US  
Date of Deposit April 28, 2003

I hereby certify that this is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Address" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By: Maisie C. Livengood  
Maisie C. Livengood

Attorney Docket No.: 020444-000400US

#9  
5/7/03  
PATENT  
Election  
**RECEIVED**  
MAY 05 2003  
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:

Luke V. Schneider

Application No.: 09/553,424

Filed: April 19, 2000

For: **METHODS FOR CONDUCTING  
METABOLIC ANALYSES**

Examiner: Samuel W. Liu

Art Unit: 1654

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION  
REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed March 26, 2003. The original deadline for response was April 26, 2003, which, because it fell on a Saturday, is extended until April 28, 2003. Accordingly, this response is timely filed.

The current restriction requirement is the second in a series of restriction/election requirements. Whereas the Primary Examiner originally handling the case required only a species election, the current restriction requirement is significantly more stringent. Not only does the current restriction requirement restrict the claims into two groups, it converts what was originally a species election into two additional restriction requirement.

Specifically, Applicants are required to elect between Group I (claims 1-26 and 36-38) and Group II (claims 27-35). Applicants are further required to: (i) restrict the claims to

Application No. 09/553,424  
Response to Restriction Requirement dated April 28, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2003

one of the substrates listed in claims 10 or 16, and (ii) restrict the claims with respect to one of the spectroscopic means listed in claims 21 and 38.

In response, Applicants make the following elections with traverse:

Group I (claims 1-26 and 36-38);

Substrate: nucleotides

Spectroscopic means: mass spectrometry

These elections are made with traverse for several reasons. First, restricting the claims to one of the substrate species listed in Markush claims 10 and 16 and to one of the spectroscopic means listed in Markush claims 21 and 38 is contrary to restriction practice as described in MPEP 803.02. This section of the MPEP makes clear that even when a Markush-type claim includes independent and distinct inventions (as the Office Action asserts is the case here) the Office should at most require a provisional election of a single species prior to examination on the merits. This practice strikes an appropriate balance between the concerns of the Office regarding administrative concerns and unduly burdensome examination, and the clear constitutional and statutory rights of an inventor to claim an invention as it is contemplated. Such a species election with respect to the substrate species was in fact the approach taken by the Primary Examiner previously handling the case. It is respectfully submitted that if any type of restriction is required with respect to the species listed in the Markush claims 10, 16, 21 and 38 that it should be a species election rather than an actual restriction. In short, the case should be handled along the lines of the original species election requirement.

Secondly, if the Office maintains the restriction with respect to the species listed in claims 10 and 16, it is requested that the Office at least examine the claims with respect to both nucleotides and nucleosides. In accordance with MPEP 803.02, the Office cannot require an election of a single species prior to examination on the merits if the members are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination can be made without serious burden, even if the members are directed to independent and distinct inventions. If the claims were restricted to nucleotides and nucleosides, there would only be two species. Furthermore, a search of nucleotides and nucleosides would be expected to be largely coextensive given the

Application No. 09/553,424  
Response to Restriction Requirement dated April 28, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2003

similarity in chemical structure. Therefore, it is requested that the claims at least be searched and examined with respect to both nucleotides and nucleosides.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott L. Ausenhus  
Reg. No. 42,271

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SLA:sla  
DE 7102740 v1